

<b>I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VII. THE ARGUMENT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>20</b>

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/685,192  
Filing Date: 10/14/2003  
Applicant(s): Duncan L. Mewherter, Amy D. Travis, Koah-Hsing Wang  
and Robert C. Weir  
Entitled: RETRIEVING SLIDE SHOW CONTENT FROM  
PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS  
Examiner: Debrow, James J.  
Group Art Unit: 2176  
Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

**TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith is Appellant's Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed September 23, 2011. As this Appeal Brief has been timely filed within the two-month shortened statutory period, no extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required. Notwithstanding, please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account **12-2158**, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: November 23, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

**Customer Number 46321**

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/685,192  
Filing Date: 10/14/2003  
Applicant(s): Duncan L. Mewherter, Amy D. Travis, Koah-Hsing Wang  
and Robert C. Weir  
Entitled: RETRIEVING SLIDE SHOW CONTENT FROM  
PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS  
Examiner: Debrow, James J.  
Group Art Unit: 2176  
Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed September 23, 2011, wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 through 22.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

This application is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation by assignment recorded on October 14, 2003, at Reel 014611, Frame 0968.

## **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

## **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1 through 22 are pending in this Application and have been three-times rejected. It is from the multiple rejections of claims 1 through 22 that this Appeal is taken.

## **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

The claims were last amended in the amendment of June 1, 2011 (the "Last Amendment").

## **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Independent claims 1 through 22 are respectively directed to a system, method and apparatus for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application such as a Web conferencing or virtual classroom application. In Appellants' invention, a slide show presentation in its native format can be processed to extract slide title information for each slide in the slide show presentation. Additionally, important text within the slide further can be extracted. Each slide in the slide-show can be converted to a raster image and disposed within markup. The markup can be annotated with the important text and both the markup and the slide title can be provided to the non-presentation application for use in concert with the non-presentation application. In this way, the context of each slide can be preserved for use within the non-presentation application as can an image of each slide itself.

With reference to independent claim 1 and in accordance with the Appellants' invention, a system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications can include a slide show (Figure 1, Element 120) produced by a slide show presentation application (Figure 1, Element 110) and stored in a native format (Page 10, lines 11-13). The system also can include a slide show conversion process (Figure 1, Element 200) configured for coupling to a non-presentation application (Figure 1, Element 150) and programmed both to extract contextual data (Figure 1, Element 130) from said slide show in its native format (Page 10, lines 11-13), and also to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery (Figure 1, Element 140) for use in said non-presentation application (Figure 1, Element 150).

With reference to independent claim 6, a method for converting a slide show presentation can be provided for use within a non-presentation application. The method can include extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 220). The method also can include converting the first slide into a raster image. (Page 10, Par 3, Figure 2, Block 230) The method yet further can include disposing both the slide title and the raster image in a markup language document. (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Blocks 235 and 240) Finally, the method can include repeating the extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation. (Page 11, Par 1, Figure 2, Blocks 255 through 260).

With reference to independent claim 16, a machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for converting a slide show presentation can be provided for use within a non-presentation application. The computer program can include a routine set of

instructions which when executed by a machine perform steps including extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 220), converting the first slide into a raster image (Page 10, Par 2, Figure 2, Block 230), disposing both the slide title and the raster image in a markup language document (Page 10, Par 3, Figure 2, Blocks 235 and 240) and repeating the extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation. (Page 11, Par 1, Figure 2, Blocks 255 through 260).

## **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

1. Claims 16 through 22 are statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
2. Claims 1 through 5 comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.
3. Claims 1 through 9, 12, 14 through 19 and 22 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0202349 by Erol et al. (Erol) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0194035 by Chakraborty.
4. Claims 10, 11, 13, 20 and 21 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) over Erol in view of Chakraborty and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,162,691 to Chatterjee et al. (Chatterjee).

## **VII. THE ARGUMENT**

### **THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 16 THROUGH 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

On page 4 of the Last Non-Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 16 (and by extension, claims 17 through 22) under 35 U.S.C. 101 because Examiner believes the claimed invention to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. As previously amended, claims 16 through 22 recite a storage medium. The notion that a storage medium recites statutory subject matter is supported by a recent Decision for the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter the Honorable Board). Specifically, reference is made to the non-precedential opinion of Ex parte Mehta (Appeal No. 2008-004853). In reversing a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Honorable Board held the following:

We agree with Appellants (App. Br. 10-11; Reply Br. 1-3), however, that, contrary to the Examiner's contention, claims 29-42 necessarily include a storage medium since the language of independent claim 29 recites an "article comprising a storage medium...." Further, the language of independent claim 29, which recites that the storage medium stores computer-executable instructions which are readable and cause a computer to perform the listed operations, establishes the requisite structural and functional interrelationships between the computer and the stored instructions which permit the computer's functionality to be realized. *See In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84 (Fed. Cir. 1994). (emphasis added)

More recently, the Honorable Board has recognized a distinction between a "computer usable medium" and a "computer usable storage medium" in finding a computer program product claim reciting a "computer usable storage medium" to be statutory in nature.<sup>1</sup>

Specifically, in Ex Parte Dureau the Honorable Board found that the recitation in a computer program product claim of a "computer readable storage medium" as opposed to a

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex Parte Vincent Dureau (2010 WL 3389299, Appeal No. 2009-007211)

"computer readable medium" necessarily excludes a signal.<sup>2</sup> More to the point, in just the past few months, in Ex Parte Bash<sup>3</sup> the Honorable Board not only found the recitation of "computer readable storage medium" to recite statutory subject matter, but the Honorable Board did so observing that the specification in Ex Parte Bash distinguished storage devices from signals as two different types of computer readable media.<sup>4</sup>

With the opinions of Ex parte Mehta, Ex parte Dureau and Ex parte Bash in mind, independent claim 16 recites a "computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having stored therein computer usable program code." Claim 16 also recites that the computer usable program code is used by a machine (i.e., a computer hardware system) to perform various steps of a method. Thus, consistent with the opinions of Ex parte Mehta, Ex parte Dureau and Ex parte Bash, the language of Appellants claims 16 through 22, which recites that the storage medium stores computer-executable instructions which are readable and cause a computer to perform the listed operations, establishes the requisite structural and functional interrelationships between the computer and the stored instructions which permit the computer's functionality to be realized.

It is further noted that claims 16 through 22 are drawn to a "machine readable storage medium," not just a "machine readable medium." Thus, Applicants request Examiner to realize the full import of the meaning of the term "storage." A transitory medium such as signal does

---

<sup>2</sup> Id. at \*2 ("We agree with Appellant that the amended claim is statutory because it is now directed to a tangible computer readable *storage* medium, and not to an intangible signal.")

<sup>3</sup> Ex Parte Bash (2010 WL 5199590, Appeal No. 2009-007202)

<sup>4</sup> Id. at \*2 ("The portion of Appellants' Specification mentioned by the Examiner (Ans. 3) describes storage devices and signals as two different types of computer readable media. Spec. 37:6-12. The claims, however, are limited to storage media, and thus do not encompass signals.")



not "store" anything. Instead, a signal transmits information. Unlike a signal which as a propagation medium and not a storage medium, transmits information, storage implies some type of temporal permanence. For that reason, those skilled in the art, as well as the Honorable Board in the decision rendered within Ex parte Mehta, recognize there is a difference between a transmission medium (e.g., light, electricity, EMF, etc.) and a storage medium (e.g., memory, hard disk, CD-ROM, etc.).

Finally, a "storage medium" is well-known to mean "any device or recording medium into which data can be copied and held until some later time, and from which the entire original data can be obtained."<sup>5</sup> By comparison, a signal cannot hold data until some later time due to its transitory nature. This clearly indicates that a "storage medium" is not a transitory medium, but a tangible medium and thus is statutory subject matter.

For the above-described reasons, Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 16 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

#### **THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

At pages 5 and 6 of the Last Non-Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1 through 5 as failing to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written

---

<sup>5 5</sup> McGraw-Hill Science & Technology Dictionary. McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms; Answers.com accessible at <<http://www.answers.com/topic/storage-medium#ixzz1E34oFbAh>> (visited February 15, 2011)

description of the invention".<sup>6</sup> This requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement.<sup>7</sup> The written description requirement has several policy objectives, but the 'essential goal' of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed.<sup>8</sup> Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention.<sup>9</sup> The 'written description' requirement implements the principle that a patent must describe the technology that is sought to be patented; the requirement serves both to satisfy the inventor's obligation to disclose the technologic knowledge upon which the patent is based, and to demonstrate that the patentee was in possession of the invention that is claimed.<sup>10</sup>

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention.<sup>11</sup> An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Boston Scientific Corp v. Johnson & Johnson*, No. 2010-1230 (Fed. Cir. June 7, 2011)

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1560, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See also *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 920-23, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1890-93 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (discussing history and purpose of the written description requirement); *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1357, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("conclusive evidence of a claim's enablement is not equally conclusive of that claim's satisfactory written description").

<sup>8</sup> *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977).

<sup>9</sup> See *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998).

<sup>10</sup> *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d 1349, 1357, 76 USPQ2d 1078, 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116.

claimed invention.<sup>12</sup> Possession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "ready for patenting" such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.<sup>13</sup>

Compliance with the written description requirement is essentially a fact-based inquiry that will 'necessarily vary depending on the nature of the invention claimed.'<sup>14</sup> A question as to whether a specification provides an adequate written description may arise in the context of an original claim which is not described sufficiently, a new or amended claim wherein a claim limitation has been added or removed, or a claim to entitlement of an earlier priority date or effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119, 120, or 365(c). Most typically, the question of written description arises in the context of determining whether new or amended claims are supported by the description of the invention in the application as filed.<sup>15</sup>

Of note, compliance with the written description requirement is a question of fact which must be resolved on a case-by-case basis.<sup>16</sup> In rejecting a claim, the Examiner must set forth

---

<sup>12</sup> *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406; *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it").

<sup>14</sup> *Enzo Biochem*, 323 F.3d at 963, 63 USPQ2d at 1613.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., *In re Wright*, 866 F.2d 422, 9 USPQ2d 1649 (Fed. Cir. 1989)

<sup>16</sup> See *Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig. v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 639 F.3d 1303, 1318-1319 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (noting that "[w]ritten description is a factual inquiry" and that "[t]he test requires an objective inquiry into the four corners of the specification from the perspective of a

express findings of fact which support the lack of written description conclusion as set forth in M.P.E.P. 2163. Those findings should first identify the claim limitation(s) at issue and subsequently establish a prima facie case by providing reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the invention as claimed in view of the disclosure of the application as filed. Importantly, in order to satisfy the written description requirement, the disclosure as originally filed does not have to provide *in haec verba* support for the claimed subject matter at issue.<sup>17</sup> Rather, the disclosure of the prior application must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, the inventor was in possession of the invention.<sup>18</sup>

In the instant case, at pages 5 of the Last Non-Final Office Action, Examiner has failed to meet the burden of articulating how the amended claims 1 through 5 in reciting "to place a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show" is not adequately enabled by the description of the invention provided in Appellants' specification so as to prevent a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed to recognize that the Appellants were in possession of the claimed invention. Rather, Examiner only provides a statement that Examiner "finds no discussion of placing a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show". Yet, the first three lines of page 11 of Appellants' specification plainly states:

In block 245 the title to the slide can be passed to the non-presentation application as can the markup language document. Within the non-presentation application,

---

person of ordinary skill in the art”). See also *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

<sup>17</sup> See *Yingbin-Nature (Guangdong) Wood Indus. Co. v. ITC*, 535 F.3d 1322, 1334-35 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

in block 250 the title can be linked to the image within the markup language document and the title further can be used separately from the image such as within a meeting agenda.

Clearly, the cited claim language in dispute "a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show " would be considered by the skilled artisan to be the "title linked to the image". Accordingly, reversal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is requested.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 12, 14 THROUGH 19 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A)**

At pages 6 and 7 of the Last Non-Final Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1 through 9, 12, 14 through 19 and 22 as being the obvious product of Erol and Chakraborty. Independent claims 1, 6 and 16 pertain to slide show presentation conversion. Exemplary claim 1 recites

1. A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:
  - a computing system with at least one processor and memory;
  - a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,
  - a slide show conversion process executing in the memory of the computing system and configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from a slide from said slide show in its native format, to convert the slide in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application and to place a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show.

Integral to claim 1, and also claims 6 and 16 which recite similar operable limitations, is the placement of a text form of contextual data extracted from a slide of a slide show in proximity to raster imagery of the slide show. So much cannot be found in the combination of Erol and Chakraborty.

Notwithstanding, Examiner argues to the contrary at page 7 of the Last Non-Final Office Action. Specifically, Examiner argues:

Erol does not expressly disclose to place a text from of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show.

Chakraborty teaches place a text from of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show (0021; 0024; 0037; 0055; Chakraborty teaches placing extracted text in a partial AIU file and placing extracted non-text in a partial AIU file, then combining both files to create a complete AIU file that represent all the extracted form information for the text and non-text portion of the file. Therefore the Examiner concludes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Chakraborty teaching for the benefit of placing a text from of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show.).

Thus, Examiner argues that the placement of extracted text and extracted non-text in the separate files that are subsequently combined into a single file is the same as the claimed "placement of a text form of contextual data that has been extracted from a slide of a slide show in proximity to raster imagery of the slide show". With respect, Examiner's comparison is flawed.

In this regard, Chakraborty fails to disclose the placement of anything proximate to the raster imagery of a slide show. In fact, Examiner concedes that at issue in Chakraborty is not a slide show, but an "AIU" file. Further, nothing in Chakraborty teaches the placement of text proximate to the raster imagery. To with, Chakraborty at paragraph [0010] admits that an AIU file is an XML file--a text file--not a raster image. Paragraph [0037] of Chakraborty is instructive:

[0037] Then, using the extracted form information (e.g., text context, lines, table boxes, etc.), a partial AIU file is created (step 28 ) to represent such extracted form information. As explained below, this partial AIU file is combined with another partial AIU file representing extracted form information for non-text (images) portions of the input file, to thereby create an AIU file representing form information for the entire input document.

In review of paragraph [0037] it is clear that no slide is rasterized and then associated in proximity with contextual text for the rasterized slide as claimed by Appellants. Rather, as clear from paragraph [0037] of Chakraborty, a form is processed to extract imagery for placement in one file and text in another. Subsequently the files are combined, but there is no teaching that any particular text in one file is associated in proximity to a corresponding image in another file.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10, 11, 13, 20 AND 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A)**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 2 through 4, 7 through 15 and 17 through 22 stand or fall together with independent claims 1, 6 and 16, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 112, first paragraph and 103(a) based upon the applied prior art are not viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 112, first paragraph and 103(a).

Date: November 23, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

**Customer Number 46321**

Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP

950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 2022

Boca Raton, FL 33487

Tel: (561) 922-3845

Facsimile: (561) 244-1062

## **VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (Previously Amended) A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:
  - a computing system with at least one processor and memory;
  - a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,
  - a slide show conversion process executing in the memory of the computing system and configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from a slide from said slide show in its native format, to convert the slide in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application and to place a text form of the contextual data in proximity to the raster imagery of the slide show.
2. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises a slide title for each one of said associated slides.
3. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises important text associated with each one of said associated slides.
4. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further comprises programming for generating a markup language document and for disposing said contextual data and said raster imagery within said markup language document.



5. (Original) The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further comprises programming for reducing said raster imagery to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device.

6. (Previously Amended) A method for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application, the method comprising the steps of:

extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application executing in memory of a computer;

converting said first slide with said slide title into a raster image;

disposing both said slide title and said raster image of said slide in a markup language document; and,

repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

7. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:

further extracting important text from said first slide;

annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language document with said extracted important text; and,

further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

8. (Original) The method of claim 6, wherein said further extracting step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics within said first slide which emphasizes said text.
9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein said formatting characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.
10. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.
11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein said generating step further comprises the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.
12. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of processing said markup language document in a non-presentation application.
13. (Original) The method of claim 12, wherein said processing step comprises the step of generating an agenda with each slide title for each raster image in said markup language document.

14. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of performing each of said extracting, disposing, converting and repeating steps in externally to a slide show presentation application which produced the slide show presentation.

15. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:  
reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device; and,  
rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive device display.

16. (Previously Amended) A machine readable storage medium having stored thereon a computer program for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps of:

extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application executing in memory of a computer;

converting said first slide with said slide title into a raster image;

disposing both said slide title and said raster image of said slide in a markup language document; and,

repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

17. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 16, further comprising the steps of:  
further extracting important text from said first slide;

annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language document with said extracted important text; and,

further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

18. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said further extracting step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics within said first slide which emphasizes said text.

19. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 18, wherein said formatting characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.

20. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.

21. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 20, wherein said generating step further comprises the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.

22. (Original) The machine readable storage of claim 17, further comprising the steps of: reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device; and, rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive device display.

## **IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellant in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

## **X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

Since Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.